

Avedis K. Sanjian and Abraham Terian

AN ENIGMATIC LETTER OF GREGORY MAGISTROS

The document under consideration is Letter 12 of Gregory Magistros (ca. 990-1059), an Armenian nobleman and writer, whose more than eighty *T'ught'k'* or *Letters*¹ contain valuable correspondence with certain native and foreign dignitaries of his day. While the collection is a mine of historical, political, social, and biographical material, this Letter is noted not so much for its contents as for the inherent difficulties of the text, which borders on unintelligibility. Gregory's writing style in general is not easy: what makes the *Letters* somewhat incomprehensible is the fact that his language is heavily influenced by Byzantine training and abounds with Greek elements which he tries to pass on as a mark of erudition.² This study is an attempt to derive as much meaning as possible from what appears to be the most enigmatic writing in the entire collection.

I. INTRODUCTION

Brief introductions to the sender and to the recipient of Letter 12 are necessary before we proceed to the text, translation, and commentary. On Gregory, the introduction by K. Kostanians' in his edition of Gregory's *Letters* is hitherto unsurpassed.³ In the same edition Kostanians' devotes an appendix to the addressees of Gregory, where a fair introduction to the recipient, Hovhannēs, Archbishop of Siwnik', is found among others.⁴ To be sure, a more detailed account of Gregory's life and a commensurate treatment of the *Letters*, beginning with a critical text and translation and culminating in a historical and literary commentary, are needed — with the biographical part of the needed study being necessarily informed by the *Letters*.

Gregory was born in Bjni, a village in the valley of the Hrazdan or Zangu River — a tributary to the Araxes west of Lake Sevan, to the princely Pahlavuni-Kamsarian (Neo-Kamsarakan) family with claims to Parthian and Jewish ancestry⁵ and relation to Gregory the Illuminator and the Mamikonians. He flourished in the first half of the

eleventh century, excelling more in literary than in military prowess. His *Letters* indicate that he was well versed in Greek literature and, like his epic poetry on biblical history (*Taghasats'ut'iwnk'* — the first epic of considerable length in Armenian literature),⁶ they reveal a profound knowledge of the Scriptures. A truly erudite person, he was not slow to display his erudition throughout his correspondence, a factor that adds significantly to his already difficult style. On the political scene, he was somehow obliged to turn over to the Byzantines several Armenian fortresses under his jurisdiction. This was attributable partly to the independent Armenian states' succumbing to the demands of Emperor Basil II (976-1025) and his successors and partly to traditional family rivalries between the pro-Byzantine Mamikonians and the cautiously pro-Islamic Bagratids.⁷ Gregory, however, was compensated by being made Dux of Mesopotamia, which included the southern districts of Vaspurakan and Tarōn, and was given the title of Magistros by the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055).⁸

More could be said about the author, but little is known about the recipient, Hovhannēs, Archbishop of Siwnik' for fifty years (1006-1056).⁹ An intimate friend of Gregory, he is the recipient of Letters 11-17. He was Gregory's teacher at one time, as indicated by the closing paragraph of Letter 11: "These my [words] to you are the fruit gathered from your own vineyard, my father and lord, nurturer and teacher." In the opening line of Letter 13, Gregory addresses him as "You who imparted light to me." In the same Letter Gregory complains about some strange — if not bizarre — funerals conducted by certain priests and begs the Archbishop to take action against them. The Archbishop's religious reforms are acknowledged by the thirteenth-century historian of Siwnik', Step'anos Ōrbēlian: "[The rebellious elements] he won back and subordinated unto himself, and relentlessly chased away the alien and wolf-like shepherds."¹⁰ These remarks on the activities of the Archbishop and his times are in harmony with the *Geist* of the Letter under consideration.

The date of Letter 12 has to be placed after 1047, the year Gregory's uncle Vahram Sparapet died in a futile attempt to save the city of Ani.¹¹ This is the date of the eulogizing Letter 11, sent to the same recipient, who officiated at Vahram's funeral. Gregory was in Constantinople at the time and did not return to his native land until four years later (1051).¹² Since the contents of the Letter under consideration suggest that it was written in old age and in native land,¹³ and since the Archbishop died in 1056, it remains to conclude that the date of the Letter would be ca. 1051-1056, at which time, most likely, Letters 13-17 were also written. Of these, 14-17 are composed in a

somewhat similar style of allegorizing. Letter 13 has Tarōn as its provenance of writing and in it Gregory tells of his plan to go (once more)¹⁴ to the Emperor (Constantine IX Monomachos, 1042-1055) to plead for an end to the turmoil besetting the land, so that thereafter he could devote himself completely to God. He urges the Archbishop to remain at his bishopric in the meantime. Gregory's complete devotion to God is realized in this enigmatic Letter, where we find him among a group of elderly monastics.

II. TEXT

The text below is that published by Kostaniant's (pp. 45-46), to which we have added the marginal enumeration of lines for quick and easy reference. Also, following the text, we have reproduced the variant readings provided in the *apparatus criticus* of the same edition (p. 257).

(45)

ԺԲ

Առ արքեպիսկոպոսն վասն ձկանց սուղ ինչ իմաստասիրել:

- Երիս պատճառս զմեզ հարկէ սուղ ինչ իմաստասիրել,
 ով գլուխ քահանայական պարու, զուղակս յԱրածանույ դի-
 մեալ ի մերոյն ծայրէ եթէ եկն բնակեցաւ եւ ոչ ճահաւորեալ
 5 ըմբոն ի նախուստ կերտողէ, առ մեզ անիրաւեալ, փախեաք
 առ ձեզ իրաւադատ կարծելով: Զոր եւ երկրորդն ծայրացեալ
 նոյն պատկեր պատկանեալ վեհագոյն, դատ մեզ արարեալ,
 զըմբռնողսն մեր ի բաց մղեաց եւ այլուր զնոսա պատահեաց
 արբանեկել: Բայց որ ի նոցունց սերք ոչ թողուն զմերս
 10 տեսակ իբրու զոսոխս, ռիս իմն կալեալ զկնի մեր, յաճա-
 խեն կոտորել եւ բնաջինջ յարմատոց թողուլ: Զոր ոչ գան-
 ձին կարացաք վնաս երբէք դիտել առ նոսա. զի մի ռմն խո-
 րասոյզ մերոյն հաւու ամփոփեալ, յախոնդիսն պատսպարեալ
 15 օթեւանեաց, եւ յիւրն հանեալ սեպհական ամբողջ զնա առա-
 քեաց. եւ այս մանաւանդ երախտեաց արժանի. իսկ զմի միւ-
 սոյն մերոյ հաւու աշակերտեալք, ուսան զբոլորն գիտութեան
 մակացութիւն. եւ ոչ զնոցա եմք ճաշակեալ երբէք ջանիւ
 վաստակոց՝ ոչ ի տունս, ոչ յանդաստանս, ոչ ի քաղաքս,
 20 ոչ պահապանս մեզ ի գայլոց կամ ի գողոց, ոչ սննդեան, ոչ
 ուսման եւ յարգարման, եւ ոչ այլ ինչ երախտիս. եւ յիրաւի
 ոչ ի վերայ մեր հնարաւորել արժանն է, զի եւ ոչ ի հաւու

նոցա Քսիւսութեայ պարառաբար պահեցաք. այլ ի միոյն
բաղկացուցանող զօրութենէ երէց եմք քան զձեզ, անմեղ,
անվնաս, ոչ յարմատոյ օղոյ որպէս դուքդ, ոչ ընդ ձեզ ձե-
25 ուրնդել կամ օտար, եւ ճաշակելով զանդաստանս, դատ արա՛
մեզ տէ՛ր:

Եւ ահա հարկ առաքեցին, գիտելով զբռնութիւն ձեր
արքունական, զի առցես զայդ ամի ամի պատարագ յաւուր
ծայրիցն որսողաց զնոսա, զոր ազատեաց Փրկիչն, եւ այլ ոչ
(46) 30 պահանջեցես: Եւ այդ ըստ իւրաքանչիւր թուոյ ի միոյ քուէէ
յարաբարդեալ քառեկին, կամ եթէ յերկուց ծննդականաց,
կամ եթէ ի քառից երից խորհրդաբար, կամ ի զարմից նա-
խահարց, կամ յընթացից արեգակնային ճառագայթից, կամ
տեսիլ նշանակեալ անպարտելի զօրութեանն, կամ սուրբ եւ
35 կենդանաբեր, կամ ի քառից ծնեալ եւ յերկուց յարաբար-
դեալ հոգւոյ եւ մարմնոյ, կամ սերկեանս ուռկանի արկելոյ
ճետք այնոցիկ, զսատերսն ընծեռեալ ի փրկութիւնն
Փրկչին ընծայեցին, ողջ լե՛ր:

(257) 45—2 սերիս, տպ. երիս. 45—16 հարաւ, տպ. հաւու.
45—20 յորդորման, տպ. յարդարման. 45—25 ձեռընտրել,
տպ. ձեռընդել. 45—25 ճարակելով, տպ. ճաշակելով. 45—27
մեր, տպ. ձեր. 46—3 նոյնահարց, տպ. նախահարց. 46—8
չիք—փրկութիւն:

The apparatus provides a preferable alternative to one of the questionable readings in the text (line 20): for *hardarman* read *hordorman*. The preference rests on *usman ew hordorman* being cognates and hence their combination. Moreover, two of the remaining variants (lines 2 and 25) may be deemed as legible as the readings in the text, though not quite as preferable. Line 2: for *eris* one may read *seris*. The latter ("our genus") is comparable to *nots'unts' serk'* ("their species") in line 9. A possible scribal error could owe to the omission of the initial, ornate letter. The sense, then, would be: "The very essence of our genus compels us. . . ." However, the preference for *eris* (accusative of *erek'*, "three") rests on its agreement with the case of the next word and on the fact that there are "three reasons" for writing the Letter (see the Commentary, Part IV). Line 25: for *chashakelov* one may read *charakelov*. While the latter provides a more appropriate construction with *handastans* (emending *zandastans*; cf. line 18), the former is to be preferred on the basis of line 17. As for the rest of the variants, priority is to be given to the readings in the text.

Several conjectural emendations could be made.¹⁵ However tempting, these steps have to be deferred to a future time — after some of the few manuscripts are collated for a critical text. For want of a better text, we have refrained ourselves from emending common corruptions of tense and mood, number and case — the high frequency of which is well attested in the transmission of Armenian texts in general. As for corrupt words transliterated from Greek (lines 22 and 37) they are noted in the Commentary (Part IV). The Translation (Part III) occasionally departs from the punctuation of the text.

III. TRANSLATION

LETTER 12

To the Archbishop, on philosophizing a little about fish.

Ther reasons compel us to philosophize a little, O head of the priestly circle.

A floating creature from Aratsan moved to our quarters; having come, he settled without making proper arrangements beforehand with the superintendent, [and] is [now] reproaching
5 us. So we appeal | to you, considering [you to be] a just judge, since the latter duly followed the same extreme example in condemning us. He shoved aside those who understand us, and, at times, he even catered to this fellow. Those of their species don't leave our kind alone. Like enemies, they are after seeking
10 revenge from us, | they are bent to slaughter and exterminate [us]. [Yet] we managed to know no physical harm at the hand of this fellow, for one of our molluscan company, constrained by the guts of sheltered residents, and all by himself, dislodged and sent him away. And this [man] especially deserves [our] gratitude.

15 As for | our company, they all have gained knowledge by becoming disciples of one another. We were never fed the fruits of others' labor, whether in homes or in fields or even in towns. We received no defenders against wolves or thieves; nothing nurturing, instructive, or edifying; or any other gratifying
20 thing. And really, | it is not fair to contrive against us; and that is not because we have been saved collectively from their school of swordfish; but because, by the only sustaining Power, we are older than you, sinless, harmless, [and] not, like you, from the source of wind; neither beyond your reach nor stranger[s];

25 rather, we have been reared in these fields. Judge | us Lord.

And behold they have sent a gift while knowing that your superior authority receives offering year after year, to this day, from the quarters of those who chased this fellow whom the Savior delivered. But you are in need of nothing else. And that is
 30 as certain as the total number of squares | obtained from a single cube; or perhaps [the offspring] of the two generative faculties; or perhaps the mysterious significance of four by three; or [the descent] from an ancestral stock; or of rays from the direction of the sun; or a symbolical vision from the invincible Power or holy and life-giving [Spirit]; or being constituted of four [elements]
 35 and having obtained both | soul and body; or [like] modern-day descendants of those who cast the net, who, upon getting the staters [from the mouths of fish], will give them for the Savior's deliverance.

Live long.

IV. COMMENTARY

This is not the place to discuss in detail the form or body of the Letter. Suffice it to say that there is a clear structure: letter-opening (lines 2-3), body-opening (lines 3-15), body-middle (lines 15-26), body-closing (lines 27-38), letter-closing (line 38). As for the purpose of the Letter, a threefold intention is discernible in its three major parts; see the comments below, on lines 2-3.

Line 1: Title

The identity of the Archbishop and the date of the Letter are discussed in the Introduction (Part I).

A metaphorical usage of imagery is employed throughout the Letter, where fish and other sea creatures consistently represent people (lines 3, 12-13, 22, [37]). This is how Gregory is "philosophizing" here. In Letters 14-17, addressed to the same recipient, we find somewhat similar "philosophizing" on the oak tree (14), apples (15), a blind musician (16), and the horse (17). In these, however, he is content for the most part to cite what certain writers have said about them in mythological writings. There is, however, a distinction between the more or less unique usage of imagery in Letter 12 and the usage of imagery in the rest. Moreover, the epistolary style in this Letter is somewhat distinct from the others.¹⁶

Lines 2-3: Letter-opening

The three reasons for writing the Letter correspond with the three

parts of its body: (1) to solicit support for the courageous individual who against the wishes of the superintendent dislodged the unwelcomed guest, lines 3-15; (2) to be protective of the community whose virtues he praises, lines 15-26; and (3) to prevent the Archbishop from obligating himself to the opponents of the community, lines 27-38.

Lines 3-15: Body-opening

Ghughak, as in Gk. *plōtos*, stands for fish or water-animals in general and the *muraenae* in particular.¹⁷ Aṛatsan (Murat Su) is a major tributary of the Euphrates east of Lake Van. As suggested earlier, unless all references to fish or water-animals in this Letter are taken as allusions to people, the Letter would be altogether meaningless. Accordingly, the "floating creature from Aṛatsan," the unwelcomed guest, is a transient lodger from the province of Tarōn and, probably, a heretical missionary.¹⁸

At the outset, the Letter seems to suggest that Gregory had joined a monastic community, perhaps for some time during the closing years of his life.¹⁹ The repeated references to his community in this section and the next, and his use of the first person plural — whereby he intimately associates and identifies himself with the group, are noteworthy. It is not uncommon for medieval nobility to join monastic communities at least for a season of penance or for temporary withdrawal from worldly cares: one good example, among others, is that of King Het'um II (1289-1293, 1295-1297) of Armenian Cilicia. Letter 11, addressed to the same Archbishop, who in 1047 officiated at the funeral of Gregory's uncle Vahram, credits the parents of the deceased, that is, Gregory's grandparents Grigor and Shushan, with founding new monasteries and restoring old ones, adding that there were no monastic establishments until their day. In the same eulogizing Letter Gregory refers to the building activities of his late uncle, which are attested by the contemporary chronicler Aristakēs of Lastivert.²⁰ It could be that Gregory was at one of the monasteries built or restored by his ancestors — if not at one of those restored by himself and that within the province of Siwnik'. Hayots' T'aṛ, in the vicinity of Garni, not far from Erevan, was restored by the young Gregory in 1013 and appears to have been a favorite place.²¹ Another possible site could be the convent of Surb Astuatsatsin in his native Bjni, where he also built the church bearing the same name in 1031.²² Another place where Gregory might have retired — though not at the time of writing this Letter — is the monastery of Kech'arīs or Kech'aruk', in the province of Tsaghkunik' or Tsaghkotn, which was dedicated to his namesake Gregory the Illuminator, and was restored by him in 1051.²³

Throughout this section and the next, Gregory's community appears to be elderly. The vulnerability of the superintendent to the persuasions of the unwelcomed visitor and his joining him in censuring the members of the community may owe to the effects of advanced age (moreover, it may not be wrong to assume that overseeing positions in monasteries usually belong to seniority). This also explains why Gregory does not criticize the superintendent in his further remarks but speaks of outside enemies collectively and is protective of his community as a whole. It is also noteworthy that Gregory refers to the courageous member of his community as "one of our molluscan company," thereby alluding perhaps to the age-hardened skin of the elderly members who are thus "sheltered" or "armored." This may be further substantiated by the allusion to the opponents in the following section as "swordfish," and in this section by the distinction made between "their species" and "our kind."

Lines 15-26: Body-middle

In his monastic environment Gregory appears to be a spokesman more for his peers than for himself.²⁴ He is apprehensive of external influences possibly resulting from heretical tendencies.²⁵ He is on guard against outsiders and protective of his community, which seems to have habitually practiced extreme abstinence, perhaps even a hermetic life. Gregory's presence at such a place and association with such a company may be seen as extreme — if not final — penance. This view may be further established by the observation made earlier that the Letter belongs to the closing years of his life.

The notion of the community's advanced age is repeated here. The words "we are older than you" do not necessarily mean that the writer is older than the recipient, whose vigor or zest is referred to as "from the source of wind," but are to be seen in light of Gregory's associating and identifying himself with a group of elderly men, who on the average would be older than the Archbishop, who himself is an old man.²⁶

A major substantiation of the metaphorical usage of fish for people is to be seen in the reference to the opponents as a "school of swordfish" (Arm. *k'siwsut'reay* appears to be a derivative of *k'siwp'iē*, from Gk. *xiphias*).²⁷ The depiction of the opponents as "swordfish" marks the height of Gregory's polemic against them.

Lines 27-38: Body-closing

The concluding lines of this section, as we shall see, suggest that the opponents of Gregory's community have sent money to the Arch-

bishop. Gregory's burden here is to prevent the Archbishop from accepting it, lest he be obligated to yield to the demands of the donors. The Archbishop is reminded of the revenue he receives regularly from Gregory's quarters and, in a straightforward manner, is told that he is in no need of additional income. Gregory goes on to illustrate this certainty with a long list of veracities and in his customary style.

The last illustration which also serves as a final appeal and helps clarify much of the ambiguity of the Letter is based on an episode recorded in Matthew 17:24-27. According to the Gospel account, Peter was confronted by the collectors of the temple dues who inquire whether Jesus paid the half-*shekel* required annually from every Jewish male. Upon presenting the matter to Jesus, Peter was sent to the sea with the prediction that he will catch a fish with a *statēr* in its mouth and was told to give this coin on behalf of the two of them. Arm. *sater* is a corruption of Gk. *statēr*, the equivalent of a *tetradrachm* or a *shekel*. The use of the plural "staters", instead of the singular in the biblical text, is in keeping with Gregory's epistolary intention. The coins obtained from the mouths of fish, the donors, are indicative of the monetary gift given to the Archbishop.

With this biblical illustration Gregory is suggesting that the Archbishop, who stands as a spiritual descendant of the Apostle, should do likewise in not keeping the money for himself. Should it be that he has already accepted the money, there is still an opportunity for him to give it back to those laying burdensome demands.

Line 38: Letter-closing

"Live long," or, simply, "Live"; a common letter-closing, which appears also at the end of Letters 13-17, addressed to the same recipient.²⁸

V. EXCURSUS

Our understanding of Letter 12 differs sharply from that of Kostaniant's. He gives the following interpretation in his brief remarks on the Archbishop: "From the banks of Aṛatsan the Pahlavuni prince [Gregory] has sent fish to his friend [the Archbishop] on the day of the holy Apostles; on that occasion he amuses himself by putting in the mouths of fish a protest against fishermen." He then quotes lines 26-29 and goes on to add: "The number of the fish is 12, which is symbolic; there are 12 apostles, patriarchs, zodiacal signs, months of the year, etc.; he shows this in a riddle." Lines 30-32 are then quoted.²⁹

While Kostaniant's admits of some symbolism in certain lines, he

fails to see it throughout the Letter. He also fails to recognize — much less identify — the specific species and their metaphorical use, thereby missing the whole point of the Letter. Should the fish be understood literally, there would be numerous and serious difficulties with most of the other parts of the Letter, including the Scriptural passage contemplated in the closing lines. Until a better sense could be made of the document as a whole, we shall be committed to our interpretation.

Avedis K. Sanjian

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Abraham Terian

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES

1. K. Kostanians', ed., *Grigor Magistrosi T'ghet'erë* (Alexandropol, 1910), hereafter Kostanians'.

2. He tries very hard to impress the addressees with his learning, as may be gathered also from his epic poetry addressed to Manuch'ë, a Muslim scholar whom he meets in Byzantium (*Taghasats'ut'iwnk' Grigori Magistrosi Pahlawunwoy*, Venice, 1868).

3. Kostanians', pp. ix-xlvi.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 291-294.

5. So he claims in Letter 11 and in his lengthy verse, *Taghasats'ut'iwnk'*, p. 73. For later affirmations by Nersës Shnorhali, see Kostanians', pp. xii-xiv. For more on such claims and their origin among the Bagratids, the traditional rivals of the Mamikonians, see Cyrille Toumanoff, "On the Date of Pseudo-Moses of Choren," *Handes Amsorya*, 75 (1961), 467-476, and *idem*, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Washington, D. C., 1963), pp. 330-334.

6. See above, n. 2.

7. The tension between the two dynasties is felt strongly in Gregory's correspondence with an intimate friend, Sargis Vardapet of Ani (Letters 18-21; cf. 22). Gregory's uncle, Prince (Sparapet) Vahram Pahlavuni, however, made a final and futile attempt for the cause of Gagik II (1042-1045) and to save the city of Ani, where he died in battle (1047). On these turbulent years in Armenian history, see René Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071* (Paris, 1947), pp. 566-584.

8. Cf. Letter 67.

9. On the province of Siwnik', see H. Hübschmann, *Die altarmenische Ortsnamen* (Strassburg, 1904, repr. Amsterdam, 1969), pp. 263-266.

10. From *Patmut'iwn Tann Sisakan* (Moscow, 1861), chaps. 55-56, quoted by Kostanians', p. 291.

11. *Ibid.*, p. xxiv; see also above, n. 7.

12. *Ibid.*, p. xxvi.

13. On the year of Gregory's birth, see *ibid.*, p. xxix and n. 2; Gregory would be in his sixties at the time of writing; see also the Commentary (Part IV), below, on the internal evidence of the Letter.

14. Gregory's earlier presence at the imperial court (1045) and his prolonged stay in Byzantium were to avert the impending trouble; *ibid.*, p. xli.

15. E.g., line 4, for *i . . tsayrē* (ablative) read *i . . tsayr* (locative); the letter *ē* possibly being a dittographical error derived from the first letter of the next word, *et'ē*, which letters, *ē/e*, are often indistinguishable paleographically.

16. The metaphorical elements in this Letter may be compared with the parabolic elements in Letter 58, the parable of the lion and the flies. Letter 74, addressed to Gregory's son-in-law, T'orņnik, reveals much about fishes and cuisine.

17. Q.v. "*loghak*," "*ghoghak*," and "*ghōghak*" in M. Bedrossian, *New Dictionary: Armenian-English* (Venice, 1875-1879), pp. 260, 455; also, q.v. "*plōtos*" in H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; E. A. Barber ed.; Oxford, 1968), p. 1424.

18. On Gregory's contentions with the T'ondrakian sectarians, see N. G. Garsoïan, *The Paulician Heresy* (The Hague, 1967), pp. 97-101, 139-145, 158-166, 227.

19. I.e., between 1051 and 1059; see the Introduction (Part I), above, and comments on lines 15-26, below.

20. (Venice, 1844), p. 37. Vahram's magnum opus was the monastery of Marmashēn, where he was buried. Its construction lasted from 986 to 1029; it stands at the northwestern extremities of the Akhurian River or Arpa Chai (Kostaniants', p. xx).

21. For the dedicatory inscription, see Kostaniants', p. xxxii.

22. *Ibid.*, pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

23. The date of the dedicatory inscription coincides with the year of Gregory's return from Byzantium and the *terminus post quem* of the writing of this Letter; see *ibid.*, p. xxxiv.

24. For his age (not much younger than the Archbishop), education, and political and literary activities, see the Introduction (Part I), above. Letters 45-46, addressed to his disciples Barsegh and Eghishē, are suggestive of his education and teaching. Cf. Letters 23-26, addressed to Sargis Vardapet of St. Karapet, another student; Letters 24 and 26 contain instruction in philosophy; cf. also Letters 85-87, addressed to lazy, anonymous students.

25. See above, n. 18.

26. See the Introduction (Part I) and n. 24, above.

27. Q.v. "*k'siup'iē*" in Bedrossian, *Dictionary*, p. 753; also, q.v. "*xiphias*" in Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, p. 1190.

28. Among the earlier documents in the collection, see the closing lines of Letters 2, 4-7, 9-10.

29. Kostaniants', pp. 293-294.